



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

accepted by Maspero as authoritative, is regarded by many as doubtful; Babylonian history is hardly definitely determinable before B. C. 3000. Another doubtful point is the origin of the African name Cush, a name that in the Old Testament is given both to the region south of Egypt and to a part of the Tigris-Euphrates valley (Nimrod is called in Genesis, X. a son of Cush). Maspero regards the African name as brought over by immigrants from Asia; this construction, though defended by some Assyriologists, is open to objections, and cannot be regarded as historically assured. However, the account of Babylonian history is in general excellent (thus the term *patesi* is correctly explained as meaning "prefect" or "dependent kinglet"); only, too much importance is attached to the "triads" in the religious system. In the later periods the historical facts are fairly well assured, and, with a few exceptions, Maspero includes the results of the most recent investigations. The Hebrew history is skilfully interwoven with that of the surrounding peoples. A singular though not very important inaccuracy occurs on page 792: it is there stated that some of the nobles of Jerusalem were exiled by Artaxerxes Ochus to Hyrcania, and in a foot-note reference is made to Josephus's *Antiquities*, xi. 7, 1; but Josephus's statement (which does not mention exile) refers to an entirely different affair, and the authority for the exile is the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.

C. H. Toy.

The Political Theories of the Ancient World. By WESTEL WOODBURY WILLOUGHBY, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Political Science in the Johns Hopkins University. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xiii, 294.)

IN this book Professor Willoughby has made an important addition to the literature of the history of political theories. In English hitherto, except for numerous articles in the different journals, we have had only two or three works that need to be mentioned—those of Pollock, Dunning, and Merriam. Dunning's work, comprising so far only one volume, which is devoted to ancient and medieval times, might be supposed to render this history by Professor Willoughby superfluous, but the two books, although both dealing with the ancient theories, really occupy different positions. On the whole Dunning is only the objective historian, limiting "himself quite strictly", as Professor Willoughby points out (preface, xii), "to an account of political theories as they are to be found crystallised and explicitly stated in literature". Dunning is blind neither to the "contemporaneous facts of public life . . . of which the writings were born" nor to "the practical lessons which their authors endeavored to teach", as Professor Willoughby also recognizes, and this, as really only a part of the character of an objective historian, is both the merit and the defect of his work. Professor Willoughby, on the other hand, seeks beyond the bare facts, whether of life or theory, "the political presuppositions involved, . . . the political ideas implicit in the systems of governments and laws of the times and peoples consid-

ered", and this in its turn shows the standpoint from which the present review must be written. Does Professor Willoughby really, as he claims, "supplement rather than duplicate" Dunning's earlier work? Also, does he give us a book that, to use his own words, really "resembles in some respects a philosophy of history"?

The answer is an affirmative one, at least so far as the supplementary character of his book is concerned. Professor Willoughby has justified his book. Yet he has not accomplished all that his readers might reasonably expect. Of course, unqualified answers, negative or affirmative, are not at all in good form at the present time, but while Professor Willoughby has produced a decidedly valuable book for students of political theories, supplying much toward what has hitherto been lacking, there are several specific counts that can and must be made against the success of his undertaking. Three of these may be mentioned here, one bearing upon the general character of the book, the other two upon the treatment of special subjects.

Thus, in the first place, the author even in a limited sense cannot be said to have written a philosophy of history. Perhaps for "practical purposes" a professional philosopher is hardly a fair judge on this point, but I very much doubt if even the resemblance promised will be apparent to many readers. Most will be left with only a very hungry satisfaction. Few will and none should seek an abstract logic of history, but all have a right to expect more connective paragraphs or, rather, more connective ideas. It is true that Professor Willoughby is free from the bondage of dates, but he is not altogether free from the idea of times as bounded by them. Dates do not make real history, nor does mere indifference to them insure an escape from the unreal history that dates do make. Thus Professor Willoughby has certainly identified men and theories with the life of their times; he has made the identification fairly vital; he has shown in particular what being a Greek or a Roman meant politically and how the different theories grew as plants out of the soils which Greek and Roman life provided, and such a showing is far on the way to a true philosophy of Greco-Roman history; but nevertheless his book lacks the movement and continuity necessary to a truly philosophical account of history. Again, he has, besides his sense of the intimacies between the theories and the things political, also a sense of the place of these things and theories in the more general life and the more comprehensive philosophy of the times with which he deals; but with this, which counts for much, he still fails, at least exoterically, to give even a general reader's philosophy of history. To waive certain less conspicuous evidences of this failure, such as the more polite than appreciative treatment of the oriental philosophy (Chapter II., 13-22), and particularly of the part of the Jews in political history (Chapter III., 23-30), the discussion of Stoicism and Epicureanism (Chapter XII.) is signally inadequate. These great ethical philosophies are indeed interesting in themselves and, as Professor Willoughby shows clearly enough, they were pertinent to their time, but he sees their time too statically or — to recall what was said

above — too much as if between dates, not enough as an activity involving a long past and a long future. Associating with them the contemporary skepticism, an appreciative historian should see in them, perhaps as much in their opposition and interaction as in their different separate ideals, the solvent by which the earlier civilizations were made parties to the Roman. They turned the human treasures and conceits of the Greeks and the other peoples of the time into non-human, wholly material things or “utilities”, which the forces since known under the name of Rome were enabled to use, and thus they were important agencies in the building of the great empire, dehumanizing or materializing the old for the free use of the new. Of this distinctly mediate function, however, in Stoicism and Epicureanism Professor Willoughby gives only the merest hint. Yet in such a book as he has undertaken, what could be more important than some such direct treatment of these great philosophies of the transition as philosophies of the transition? Has the historian no proper interest in the wise men who brought treasures out of their past and in all humility offered them to the dawning future? Has he no necessary regard for the people saying through their philosophies, “The things which were given are now taken away by the giver of them”?

But, secondly, the discussion of Plato may be mentioned as illustrating further the criticism made here. This discussion (Chapters VII.—IX.) lacks real efficiency. Plato was indeed an idealist, although not a mere dreamer, as we are finally reminded (p. 128); his idealism was of the sort that is always great, in that manifestly it was only an abstraction and hypostasis of what in different degrees had been the actual, though unconscious or only half-conscious, practice of the Greek cities for centuries; but the distinct historical value of such hypostasis, and so the real motive in Plato's theories, Professor Willoughby has somehow missed. Like any great philosophy, too, Plato's philosophy affords a sort of cross-section of the life of his times, so that to find in him only a certain doctrine, even though this doctrine is seen as formally appropriate to the day, is to be at least in danger of avoiding the real point. A cross-section is not so static as it may often seem; it is dynamic; it is like the infinitesimal of the calculus, which only focuses into a point the spacial and temporal movement of a whole system; and in the case of Plato not to see the tension or struggle—even the vacillation—with which his philosophy was quick is—what shall I say?—it is to deny him any real part in history.

And, thirdly, and lastly, in a comparison between the Roman and the modern eighteenth-century idea of law as contract it seems to me hardly safe to depend on such a statement as this: “As being . . . rationally demanded by men's very nature, the state was never viewed [by the Romans] as anything so artificial as to require a formal conventional act for its establishment. . . . There was . . . no original basis of natural right upon which the idea of a social compact could have been founded” (pp. 243–244). Was not the nature upon which the natural rights of the modern theories were based as urgent and as rational a

demand for the state as the Romans ever lived under? Though used as a sort of cry against all forms of established authority, was not nature after all rather a watchword of reconstruction than of anarchy? And "the formal conventional act", to which Professor Willoughby refers, was this anything more than a sort of legal fiction, a political category, which, while depriving every visible institution of final authority, was nevertheless an evidence of the constant demand in human nature for instituted authority in some form? The difference between the Roman and the modern idea, if difference there be, is that between fixity and movement, between the law as necessary and the law as always subject to revision. It can hardly be that between what is "rationally demanded" and what is "so artificial as to require a formal conventional act for its establishment".

So, in conclusion, this book by Professor Willoughby, while undoubtedly justified, is as much an invitation to others to work in the same vineyard as anything else. The invitation, however, has been needed, and what a book succeeds in making not only more clearly necessary but also more clearly worth while, is quite as important as what in itself it immediately achieves. Professor Willoughby's book has the real importance of both meeting a want and at the same time creating one.

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

A Social History of Ancient Ireland. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. (New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Two vols., pp. xxiii, 632; xi, 651.)

DR. JOYCE'S two volumes constitute the most comprehensive treatise on the life and institutions of ancient Ireland that has appeared for a long time. No work of similar range has been undertaken since Eugene O'Curry's *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History* (Dublin, 1861) and on the *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* (1873); and Celtic studies have made great advances in the interval. Dr. Joyce, while taking advantage of the progress of science, frankly acknowledges a large debt to his predecessor and treats his work with a respect which it has not always received from men of the newer training. In fact he sometimes quotes O'Curry or O'Flaherty (the author of *Ogygia*) when it would be more satisfactory to have references to original sources. But he is not misled by their authority, and he usually makes clear to the reader the real nature of the evidence for his statements. His work, as might be expected, frequently corrects and in large measure supersedes all earlier treatises on the subject with which it deals.

After a judicious preliminary discussion of the nature of his sources and the methods of his investigation, Dr. Joyce gives a general bird's-eye view of Irish society in the period from the sixth century to the twelfth. Then he proceeds to take up one by one different features of the national life and discusses them minutely in successive chapters. His study includes the systems of law and government; religious institutions, both